

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

WILLIAM ROBERT SHAW,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 20-C-365

DAVID SEEL, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

Plaintiff William Robert Shaw, who is representing himself, is proceeding on claims that Defendants subjected him to unreasonable strip-searches at the Milwaukee County Jail and have a “custom or policy” pursuant to which they violated his constitutional rights. Dkt. No. 46. Discovery closed August 22, 2022, and dispositive motions were due September 23, 2022. Dkt. No. 142. On September 23, 2022, Defendants timely filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. No. 162. Shaw’s materials in response to the motion are currently due January 3, 2023. Dkt. No. 192.

On November 18, 2022, Shaw filed a motion for an extension of time to conduct discovery and motion to strike Defendants’ motion for summary judgment with prejudice or in the alternative without prejudice. Dkt. No. 194. Shaw states that Defendants “willfully mislead Shaw and the Court in regards to discovery and the circumstances thereof for the malicious self-serving purposes of gaining an unfair advantage.” *Id.* at 1. Shaw states that Defendants are “conceal[ing] and withhold[ing] discovery.” *Id.* at 2.

The Court will deny the motion. First, Shaw does not specify what discovery is still outstanding. As explained in prior orders, no videos exist of Shaw being strip-searched at the Milwaukee County Jail; and Defendants have already provided the other evidence he requested that was proportional to the needs of the case. *See* Dkt. Nos. 180 & 192. Shaw mentions “interrogatories and requests for admissions directed to Defendant Sobek,” *see* Dkt. No. 194, ¶1, but those responses were mailed to Shaw on October 4, 2022, *see* Dkt. No. 180. Toward that end, Shaw admits that “after the October 4, 2022 hearing, I received some of the outstanding discovery requests . . . .” Dkt. No. 194, ¶5. Shaw claims that he has not received “everything,” *see id.*, but without specific information on what is still missing, Shaw has not shown good cause to extend the discovery deadline. Second, the Court will not strike Defendants’ motion for summary judgment based on Shaw’s vague allegations of “false information to the Court concerning significant discovery issues” and “false representation to Shaw that he would receive the outstanding unfulfilled discovery requests.” Again, it’s unclear what discovery is still missing and his allegations of false and/or misleading information to the Court appear to be baseless. The Court will deny the motion in its entirety. Shaw’s materials in response to the motion for summary judgment remain due January 3, 2023.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion for extension of time and motion to strike Defendants’ motion for summary judgment with prejudice or in the alternative without prejudice (Dkt. No. 194) is **DENIED**. Shaw’s January 3, 2023 deadline to file materials in response to the motion for summary judgment remains in effect.

Dated at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 23rd day of November, 2022.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge